

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 15 and 20 are amended, claim 21 is added, and no claims are canceled. As a result, claims 1, 3-17 and 19-21 are now pending in the application. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the disclosure, and in particular, at pages 9-11 of the specification.

In the non-final Office Action of October 31, 2006, claims 1, 3-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,025,837 (Matthews) and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,940,073 (Klosterman).

*35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection in view of Matthews / Klosterman*

Claims 1, 7 and 13 are amended herein, thus obviating the rejection of these three independent claims and the claims depending therefrom.

The §103 rejection in view of the Matthews / Klosterman hypothetical rejection of claims 17 and 19-20 is respectfully traversed.

One problem with convergence systems occurs two people would like to watch separate shows at the same time. Conventional systems allow one show to be watched while taping another channel for time-delay viewing. However, the conventional systems require that the system to be programmed in advance to record the time-delayed show—or else the

currently viewed TV program must be interrupted while the conventional system is programmed to record the other show. The present invention overcomes this drawback. Various embodiments of the present invention allow a user to display controls, or prompts, for programming functions the system—for example, to record another channel or event without interrupting the presently viewed show. This embodiment is claimed in claim 17, which recites “generating a display including information related to at least one channel wherein the display includes at least one prompt [and] receiving a command in response to the prompt wherein the command corresponds with at least one function related to the at least one channel. The hypothetical combination of Matthews and Klosterman does not teach or suggest this feature. It appears that the pending Office Action does not address this feature of the claimed invention.

The Matthews patent involves an interactive entertainment system which distributes video content to multiple subscribers over a distribution network. When a viewer using the of Matthews system activates a hyper link within the electronic program guide (EPG) the user interface launches the browser to activate the target resource specified by the hyperlink. The data retrieved from the target resource is then displayed on the display unit. It is respectfully submitted that the Matthews patent does not teach or suggest the aforementioned feature.

The secondarily cited patent of the rejection to Klosterman involves a system for displaying an electronic program schedule. The Klosterman system has various

embodiments that display program schedule information. However, Klosterman does not disclose or suggest “receiving a command in response to the prompt wherein the command corresponds with at least one function related to the at least one channel,” as recited in claim 17. Therefore, Klosterman does not overcome the deficiencies of the Matthews patent.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Matthews patent and the Klosterman patent, either taken singly or as a hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

*Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition*

It is believed that no fees or extension of time are required for this paper. However, to the extent necessary, a petition for a further extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571) 748-4765 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson  
Reg. No. 43,436

McGrath, Geissler, Olds & Richardson, PLLC  
P.O. Box 7085  
Alexandria, VA 22307

**Date: January 26, 2007**